


THE LIBRARY.

THE 'HAMLET' TRANSCRIPT, 1593.

UR bibliographical comparison of the three 'Hamlet' texts has enabled us to expose the pirate in Q 1 and to discover the existence of an early Shakespearian manuscript behind that edition. We have caught glimpses of this 'Hamlet' manuscript, but it is obviously unsafe to pronounce definitely upon its condition, until we know more about the origin and nature of the medium through which alone we can see it. We are peering through a glass darkly; how are we to distinguish flaws in the glass from defects in the treasure it reveals? The principal copy for 'Hamlet' Q 1 was some kind of reproduction of the 'Hamlet' manuscript—a *tertium quid*. The problem of the *tertium quid* must be solved before we can advance a step further.

One thing is certain. The link between Shakespeare's manuscript and the 1603 text must have been itself in manuscript. It is conceivable that Voltemar had a printed book to go upon for his edition. But even if we could prove that a hundred editions of 'Hamlet,' preceded that of 1603, they would not help us. Since the parent manuscript reached the printer's hands in 1604, it cannot have

been used as 'copy' at any previous stage of its development; for all our bibliographical experience tends to show that when once 'copy' had passed through the ink-stained hands of an Elizabethan printer, the author saw it no more. The *tertium quid* for which we are seeking was, therefore, a transcript; and, this being so, it only remains to discover the purpose for which this transcript was made, in order to determine its character. One can of course imagine several alternatives. The pirate himself, for example, might have transcribed the original manuscript for the printer.

The hypothesis, however, which I shall ask the reader to accept is that our intermediary was a shortened copy of Shakespeare's partially revised manuscript made for a touring company. Satisfactorily to establish this thesis we need more evidence than we have yet brought to bear upon the problem, and if possible external evidence. Fortunately we have such evidence in 'Der Bestrafte Brudermord,' the fourth 'Hamlet' text, to which reference has not yet been made. This German 'Hamlet,' as I hope to prove at a later stage, was undoubtedly derived from the parent English manuscript before Shakespeare had begun that revision to which Q 1 bears witness. For our immediate purpose, however, it is enough to refer to the general consensus of critical opinion, best summarised in the cautious words of the Cambridge editors: 'It is probable that the German text even in its present diluted form may contain something of the older English play upon which Shakespeare worked. . . . It does not appear that the German playwright

made use of Shakespeare's 'Hamlet,' or even of the play as represented in Q 1. The theory that it may be derived from a still earlier source is therefore not improbable.¹

I. SHORTENING.

THE clue to the character of the *tertium quid* was first put into my hands by Mr. A. W. Pollard, who, after reading through a draft of the article which precedes this, was good enough to test its conclusions by making an independent comparison of the Q 1 and Q 2 texts on his own account. He rose from this examination with the conviction that the principal copy for the 1603 'Hamlet' was a text shortened for provincial performance. The suggestion disturbed me at first, since it introduced a new complication into an already sufficiently complicated problem. I became more reconciled to it when I found that it served to explain all kinds of strange points in Q 1 which we can hardly attribute to Voltemar and should be reluctant to attribute to Shakespeare. But what finally converted me was the evidence of the 'Brudermord.' Dramatic material which is missing in Q 1 is to be found both in the 'Brudermord' and in the final 'Hamlet'; and yet Q 1 stands between them. There are many of these 'overlinks,' as we may call them, and they afford indisputable testimony to the presence of dramatic shortening in the Q 1 text. Three instances may here be quoted: (i) A Francisco

¹ 'Variorum Hamlet,' ii, p. 117. The passages from the 'Brudermord' here quoted are taken from the *Variorum* translation.

appears in the Ghost-scenes of the 'Brudermord' and the final 'Hamlet.' The name is not found in Q 1. (ii) The King's speech at the end of the Nunnery scene, which holds the same position in the 'Brudermord' as it does in Q 1, is thus given in the latter text:

Loue? No, no, that's not the cause
Some deeper thing it is that troubles him.

In the 'Brudermord' it runs:

Corambus, leave us. When we have need of you we will send for you. (*Exit Corambus.*) We have seen this madness and raving of the Prince's with great astonishment. But it seems to us that it is not genuine madness, but rather a simulated madness. We must contrive to have him removed from here, if not from life; otherwise some harm may come of it.

The exit of Corambus points to an early version, but the 'Brudermord' clearly goes back to a text containing material, absent from Q 1, which was used by Shakespeare in his final 'Hamlet.' (iii) As the Court enters in the Play-scene, Hamlet says to Horatio, in the complete drama, 'They are coming to the play. I must be idle. Get you a place.' This speech is abbreviated to 'Harke, they

¹ In Q 2 (III, i, 170 *sqq.*) Claudius begins his speech to Polonius:

Loue, his affections doe not that way tend,
Nor what he spake, though it lackt forme a little,
Was not like madness, there's something in his soule
Ore which his melancholy sits on brood,
And I doe doubt, the hatch and the disclose
Will be some danger; which for to prevent
I haue in quick determination
Thus set it downe: he shall with speede to *England*, . . .

THE 'HAMLET' TRANSCRIPT, 1593. 221

come' in Q 1. The 'idle' (i.e. crazy) motive is, however, present in the 'Brudermord,' which makes Hamlet say 'Observe everything closely, for I shall dissemble.' Now, though Voltemar might conceivably excise material from his transcript when it differed from that he was familiar with in the 1601 performance, he would be very unlikely to do so when the two texts were similar. A piratical scribe, who had somehow got Shakespeare's manuscript into his possession for a time, would be even less likely to leave such gaps. The Q 1 transcript was shortened, and shortened for acting purposes.

This shortening was at once crude and exceedingly drastic. Q 1 contains 2,143 lines as against some 3,719 in Q 2. The latter makes an unusually long play, and it is probable that the early 'Hamlet' manuscript was briefer. But something about 3000 lines seems to have been the normal length of a drama to which an Elizabethan London audience was accustomed, and Q 1 is only a little over two-thirds of this. Q 1, moreover, contains the pirate's additions, amounting on a rough computation to between 300 and 400 lines, so that the transcript would be shorter still. No doubt Voltemar sacrificed certain passages of the transcript where he thought he could provide better material himself, for example, in the case of Horatio's Fortinbras speech in 1. 1. But the evidence of the 'ur-Hamlet' scene in Act IV goes to show that where he was unable to supply 1601 material he left the original standing, however different it might be from the final version. Taking everything

into consideration, therefore, we shall probably not go far wrong if we estimate the length of the transcript as between 1,500 and 2,000 lines. In other words, it was probably one-half to two-thirds of the manuscript from which it was copied.

Abbreviation of this drastic character would involve not only long 'cuts,' but a large number of little ones. Any line, or couple of lines, which could be dispensed with, without obscuring the main action of the play, would be cheerfully thrown overboard; the sense of the immediate context was of minor importance. There are a quantity of little excisions of this kind in the Q 1 text. We find no less than three, for example, in the famous advice to Laertes in 1. 3, which, it may be observed, is fenced off from all suspicion of Voltemar's botching by the inverted commas, derived directly as we saw in the former article from the original manuscript. This is how the abbreviator saves a pair of lines:

And these few precepts in thy memory.
'Be thou familiar, but by no means vulgare.

The 'cut' is crude enough, but it might perhaps pass in a London theatre, if Shakespeare happened to be absent at the time of the performance. At the other end of the scale we have the Pyrrhus speech in 2. 2. shortened from 30 lines, if we may take Q 2 as our guide, to 6 lines in Q 1. Here the crudity is far more glaring because the 'cut' reduces Corambis' expostulation as to the length of the speech to absurdity. A London audience would hardly have tolerated this. The soliloquies,

THE 'HAMLET' TRANSCRIPT, 1593. 223

as we have seen cause to think, and as might be expected, were similarly abbreviated, all except the Hecuba soliloquy, most of which it was necessary to retain for the sake of the story. At the beginning of this last, however, there is one 'cut' which introduces us to another side of the business. The first three lines runs as follows:

Why what a dunghill idiote slaue am I?
Why these Players here draw water from eyes:
For Hecuba, why what is Hecuba to him, or he to
Hecuba?

Ten lines are reduced to three; but as the miserable second line shows, it has been found necessary to apply a piece of plaster to cover the rent. In other words we have to reckon not only with shortening, but also with adaptation.

And there is a third point to be borne in mind. If, as I think the reader will by now be prepared to agree, the wholesale and clumsy nature of this shortening points unmistakably to provincial standards, we should expect to find the excision not only of lines but also of speaking parts, since touring companies were normally smaller in number than those a London theatre could support, and costumes would be fewer. Now this is precisely what we do find. In the previous article we have seen reason to think that before Voltemar began to make his additions, the transcript contained no Fortinbras, no Danish Ambassadors, and probably no Barnardo. There are indications also that the actors who took Rossencraft and Gilderstone, to use the Q 1 nomenclature, were expected to play

Duke and Murderer in the play-scene, a thing or course impossible in the F 1 text. It would be easy indeed to effect still further economy of manpower by a little manipulation when the players' parts were made out. Taking the Q 1 text, without the Voltemar additions, as the basis, I estimate that the play could be performed by six or seven men and two boys, while to perform the F 1 text properly at least ten men and two or three boys would be required.

But how would such an acting-copy for the provinces be made? First we may suppose the stage-adapter ran through the original manuscript, marking passages for omission. Next the manuscript was handed to a scrivener, or some member of the company told off to do the quill-driving, and the transcript was prepared. The stage-adapter then read through the completed transcript in order to patch up the most obvious rents which he had caused to be made in the text. Lastly, still further adaptation would be possible in the players' parts, though this need not concern us here.

II. PIRATE AND STAGE-ADAPTER.

THE theory that the chief copy for Q 1 was a shortened transcript of the early 'Hamlet' manuscript satisfactorily solves our *tertium quid* problem; but it raises new and formidable ones in regard to the manuscript itself. Q 1 gives us indeed a wretched piece of glass through which to peer at our treasure-trove. The 'cuts' obscure almost half of it; there are the dirty marks of the pirate's fingers;

there is the clumsily-applied plaster of the adapter; lastly, there are copyist's errors as well as compositor's misprints to deal with. At first sight it would seem almost hopeless to attempt to differentiate between these various agencies of corruption. Yet it is at least some gain to know exactly the difficulties with which we have to cope; and, if we can succeed in laying down certain general rules of procedure, we need not entirely despair.

Now in the first place it is useless, and indeed unnecessary, to try to distinguish between the errors of copyist and compositor; they must be lumped together under the head of 'misprints'; and they will not create serious difficulties for those who have studied the misprints in the Good Quartos. In the second place, when we have determined the parts which the pirate played, as we have already done in a general way for Voltemar, we can at least point to certain scenes as likely to be free from his influence. In the third place we should be surprised to find the adapter's hand except in close connexion with the 'cuts'; he is not likely to tamper with the rest of the text. Lastly, it must be remembered that pirate and stage-adapter were actuated by entirely different motives. The latter's main object was to *cut down* the play. He would therefore be as economical with his plaster as possible. Moreover, he would do his best to make a clean join. Especially would he be careful not to disturb the verse more than he could help; since verse in the Elizabethan theatre was far more than a mere ornament, it was an invaluable aid to memory, and as such a business

asset to an acting company. His 'verse' is often sorry stuff enough, as the second line of the Hecuba soliloquy indicates. But he worked with the original manuscript in front of him, and he at any rate gets the verse-lining correct. The pirate, on the other hand, is engaged in *filling out* the shortened transcript for the press. His chief object is to provide copy, to undo the shortener's work, to restore as best he can the excised passages. He has, however, nothing but his memory of what has been said and done on the stage to guide him; and when we have transpositions of small pieces of material from one scene to another, we can feel almost certain that it is he and not the adapter who is patching a rent in the text. He has too no ear for verse whatsoever, and, unless the clauses in the passage he reports happen by coincidence to fall naturally into blank-verse lengths, he is quite incapable of correct verse-division. There is, however, one important exception to this. Occasionally, only once I think in 'Hamlet' Q 1, he is able to supply the printer with a copy of his 'part,' in which case of course the verse-lining will be correct. 'Part'-copy of this kind is generally not difficult to detect. Close correspondence with the punctuation, readings and, to some extent, the spelling and capital letters of the authoritative acting version arouses our suspicions. Lateness of style increases them. Obvious botching of all other parts in the same piece or dialogue confirms them, especially if the cue-lines, i.e. those which immediately precede the pirate's speeches are like them perfect.

But there is another complication yet to be con-

sidered, Shakespeare in his capacity of reviser. A gap in the transcript, when compared with the final text, may be due not to a 'cut' but to later addition on Shakespeare's part. Take the gap between 86 and 92 in 1. 2, which Voltemar has filled up with his rubbish, as shown in my first article (p. 173). Is it a question of 'cut' or addition? All we can say is that there is nothing in the Q 2 lines that fit into this particular socket which forbids us to suppose that they were present in the early manuscript also. And if it is sometimes difficult to detect 'cuts' in the Shakespearian portions of Q 1, it is still more so in regard to the 'ur-Hamlet' scenes, since we have nothing with which to compare them. One principle, nevertheless, may be laid down, which should be of some assistance. However poor the verse of the non-Shakespearian portions of 'Hamlet' Q 1 may be, it is verse. The lines flow smoothly, and the line-division is correct. Where these conditions do not prevail we have a right to suspect tampering, though even here the hand may be Shakespeare's as the marginalia in 1. 2 should warn us.

With these general considerations in mind, we may now take a few examples in order to show how they work out in practice. Let us begin with 1. 1. We know that the pirate is Marcellus, and we are therefore not surprised to find his lines excellently given. Yet this, as it happens, is really beside the point, since the perfection of some of Horatio's long speeches as well as those of Marcellus indicates that the basis of the Q 1 text in this scene is not 'part'-copy but transcript-copy, a conclusion which

is supported by the early style of the speeches in question. In transcript-copy we look for shortening, and find it in the absence of Francisco, and in the patent marks of the pirate at the beginning of the scene. It is of course impossible to tell exactly how the stage-adapter managed the opening dialogue; but if we leave out all those lines which are open to suspicion of piracy, we get something which probably approximates to the truncated text. Thus:

Enter Centinel, Horatio and Marcellus.

Cent. Welcome Horatio, welcome good Marcellus.

Mar. What hath this thing appear'd againe to night?

Cent. I haue scene nothing.

Mar. Horatio sayes tis but our fantasie,
And wil not let beliefe take hold of him,
Touching this dreaded sight twice scene by vs,
Therefore I haue intreated him a long
That if againe this apparition come,
He may approoue our eyes, and speak to it.

Hor. Tut, t'will not appeare.

Enter Ghost

Mar. Breake off your talke, see where it comes againe.

Cent. In the same figure like the King that's dead.

Mar. Thou art a scholler, speake to it Horatio.

Cent. Lookes it not like the king?

Hor. Most like, it horrors mee with feare and wonder.

Mar. It is offended. *exit Ghost*

Cent. How now Horatio, you tremble and looke pale,
Is not this something more than fantasie?
What thinke you on't?

Mar. Is it not like the King?

THE 'HAMLET' TRANSCRIPT, 1593. 229

This saves 40 lines (on the Q 2 account), dispenses with a character (Francisco), makes no mention of Barnardo, who was certainly absent in the later scenes, and preserves all the lines of Q 1 which contain Shakespearian misprints, spellings and abbreviations. For the rest of the scene we are on surer ground. Lines 54-75 (Q 1) are undoubted transcript-material, which has been slightly touched up in the Q 2 text. Next, we have the Fortinbras speech, which is Voltemar botch. But there must have been some answer to Marcellus' question in the transcript, if the dialogue was to have any sense at all. The late style of the corresponding speech in Q 2 gives us our clue. Shakespeare has revised the speech in the interval, and revised it so thoroughly that Voltemar feels obliged to cut the old version out and replace it by what he remembers of the new. From line 95 to the end the Q 1 text is nearly all derived from the transcript, with the exception of a little of Voltemar's botching between the entry of the Ghost and the scuffle that takes place at its exit, botching which points to transcript-cuts. But why should the last 28 lines be left unabbreviated? They are beautiful, but they serve no obvious dramatic purpose. They were, I think, allowed to remain because of their theatrical utility; they form in short a screen behind which Master Ghost is changing for some other rôle in the next scene.

The Pyrrhus speech in 2. 2, perhaps the most complicated problem in the whole text, may be taken as our other example. We will limit ourselves to a consideration of lines 147-79, here printed in

a footnote from Q 1, to enable the reader to follow the argument.' All five factors of confusion,—scrivener's errors, abbreviation, adaptation, piracy, and author's revision—are to be found within the limits of these 33 lines. The first ten are full of gross misprints, due probably to the copyist; at

The rugged *Pirrus*, he whose sable armes,
 Blacke as his purpose did the night resemble,
 When he lay couched in the ominous horse,
 Hath now his blacke and grimme complexion smeered 150
 With Heraldry more dismall, head to foote,
 Now is he totall guise, horribly tricked
 With blood of fathers, mothers, daughters, sonnes,
 Back't and imparched in calagulate gore,
 Risted in earth and fire, olde grandsire *Pryam* seekes: 155
 So goe on (accent.
Cor. Afore God, my Lord, well spoke, and with good
Play. Anone he finds him striking too short at Greeks,
 His antike sword rebellious to his Arme,
 Lies where it falles, vnable to resist. 160
Pyrus and *Pryam* driues, but all in rage,
 Strikes wide, but with the whiffe and winde
 Of his fell sword, th' unnerued father falles.
Cor. Enough my friend, t'is too long.
Ham. It shall to the Barbers with your beard: 165
 A pox, hee's for a ligge, or a tale of bawdry,
 Or else he sleepes, come on to *Hecuba*, come.
Play. But who, O who had seene the mobled Queene?
Cor. Mobled Queene is good, faith very good.
Play. All in the alarum and feare of death rose up, 170
 And o're her weake and all ore-teeming loynes, a blanket
 And a kercher on that head, when late the diademe stooode,
 Who this had seene with tongue inuenom'd speech,
 Would treason haue pronounced,
 For if the gods themselues had seene her then, 175
 When she saw *Pirrus* with malicious strokes,
 Mincing her husbandes limbs,
 It would haue made milch the burning eyes of heauen,
 And passion in the gods.

any rate all of them can I think be accounted for as careless misreadings of a manuscript written in an English hand. The lines, again, are three short of the Q 2 version which looks as though the adapter has been up to his tricks. This impression is confirmed by the evidence of careful, though at the same time crude, alteration. The verse flows, which puts Voltemar's memory out of the question; Hamlet is speaking, which puts Voltemar's 'part' out of the question; the rearrangement and omission has impaired the sense of the passage, which puts Shakespearian revision in Q 2 out of the question. It is transcript material. Hamlet stops, and the Player takes the speech over. Here in Q 1 we get only six lines, as against 30 in Q 2, before Corambis-Polonius interrupts. The 'cut' is the most obvious one in the whole text. The Pyrrhus torso in Q 1, however, is not made of quite the same material as the complete Pyrrhus of Q 2, since we have the words 'vnable to resist' instead of the more vigorous 'repugnant to command.' There appears to be no reason why the adapter should make this change, so that we are thrown back upon Shakespearian revision for an explanation. In other words the original Pyrrhus speech was different from the version with which we are now familiar. This clue is useful as helping us to understand lines 170-79. Hitherto the verse-lining has been correct, and the sense tolerably good; but when the Player gets to Hecuba everything suddenly goes to pieces. The sense vanishes, the verse disappears, and we have errors like 'speech' for 'steep' which are due to mishearing not misreading. What has happened?

Voltemar was on the stage in this scene; he has let the other lines pass by as good enough for his purpose; but when he comes to Hecuba he botches, and botches badly. He is not filling a 'cut,' for the subsequent dialogue and the Hecuba soliloquy prove that the transcript had a Hecuba speech of some kind. But it was so different from Voltemar's memory of the 1601 version, that he feels compelled to try his hand upon it.

If the reader has followed the argument with general assent up to the present point, he will, I hope, be ready to agree that the attempt to distinguish between the various factors of the tangled textual situation which Q 1 presents is not entirely hopeless. We have at least certain main principles to guide us. It would probably be dangerous if not impossible to state them more definitely than has been done above. We cannot say 'This and this invariably denote piracy, this and this adaptation, that and that Shakespearian revision.' Every passage must be carefully scrutinized, in the light of our principles, and judged on its merits. In other words, a new edition of 'Hamlet' Q 1 is needed. When that edition comes to be made, it will no doubt be found that many cruxes resolve themselves into a balance of possibilities. Too often, it is feared, the scales will remain even.

III. PROSE PRINTED IN BLANK-VERSE LENGTHS.

THE specimens quoted in the preceding section are in verse, and the question of line-division is, as we have seen, of great detective value. Nevertheless

THE 'HAMLET' TRANSCRIPT, 1593. 233

the principles just illustrated are, with slight modifications, as applicable to the prose as to the verse in Q 1. This may seem a hard saying, until full weight be given to a curious peculiarity of our text, upon which we have not yet commented, though it is one of great importance. Nearly all the prose of 'Hamlet' Q 1 is printed in lines which correspond closely with the lengths of blank-verse. Previous critics have regarded this feature as the very mark of the pirate beast. But they are wrong, as is proved by the fact that it occurs in scenes which are demonstrably untouched by Voltemar. Nor, we are positive, can it be attributed to the compositor. If there is one lesson to be learnt from a bibliographical study of the Good Quartos, it is that compositors had no means of distinguishing between prose and verse except by line-division in their copy, and all the evidence of Q 1 shows that Sims' workman followed his copy with slavish fidelity in this matter. The copyist also followed his manuscript meticulously, despite the misreadings already noticed, as is clear from the spellings and inverted commas to which reference was made in our former article. The conclusion, therefore, to which we are apparently lead, is that the business goes back to the original manuscript. And the deduction is supported by the fact that the peculiarity is to be found in texts seemingly innocent of any suspicion of piracy or stage-adaptation whatsoever. The only prose in 'Richard III,' the dialogue between the murderers in 1. 4. 101-65, is likewise printed in blank-verse lengths in the 1597 Quarto, while the same is true of all

the prose in 'The Taming of a Shrew' (1594). And if the phenomenon has nothing to do with any intermediary, whether compositor, pirate or copyist, it must belong to the early 'Hamlet,' and have its origin in the play-house. Indeed, we are tempted to suggest that, since it is only found in a limited number of plays, it was possibly connected with the practices of a particular company, or companies, of players, which for some reason or other liked to have prose broken up into verse lengths. 'The Taming of a Shrew' belonged to the Pembroke men, which makes it possible that they may have been one such company. But the whole matter is too obscure to be pursued with advantage here.

Nevertheless there is the bibliographical fact, whatever be the meaning of it. In linking 'Hamlet' with 'Richard III' and 'A Shrew' it gives us one more clue pointing to an early date for our partially revised manuscript. It even does more; it links 'Hamlet' Q 1 with two of the other Bad Quartos, for it is found in 'Henry V' Q 1 and 'Merry Wives' Q 1 as well. And its textual significance is very great. Whenever we find a prose passage which departs seriously from the normal blank-verse length, we are entitled to suspect disturbance of some kind. Full treatment of the matter must be left to a later occasion, but we may glance briefly at a couple of examples.

The botched 'To be or not to be' is followed by this speech:

THE 'HAMLET' TRANSCRIPT, 1593. 235

Ofel. My Lord, I haue sought opportunitie, which now I haue, to redeliuer to your worthy handes, a small remembrance, such tokens which I haue receiued of you.

The lines run right across the forme, and as the whole thing is a wretched piece of writing, we naturally suspect Voltemar. The question is, however, had he any transcript material to go upon? The commas guide us to a solution; for if we detach the two small phrases marked off by punctuation, we find ourselves with these lines:

My Lord, I haue sought opportunitie,
To redeliuer to your worthy handes,
Such tokens which I haue received of you.

The transcript material was not prose at all, but a piece of 'ur-Hamlet' verse!

The other specimen is more complicated. The Grave-yard scene opens with the dialogue of the two Clowns, the last half of which is supplied, as we have seen, by our friend Voltemar. Here then we have an opportunity of testing pure pirate-copy in relation to the problem of prose-lining. The transcript dialogue, we cannot doubt, ended with 'Goe fetch me a stope of drinke,' which is the Second Grave-digger's dismissal-cue tacked on to the end of the truncated version. Up to this point the prose lines run to the length of more or less normal blank-verse, though there has perhaps been some slight disturbance owing to the adapter's abbreviations. Voltemar's addition must be quoted in full.

Goe fetch me a stope of drinke, but before thou
Goest, tell me one thing, who buildes strongest,
Of a Mason, a Shipwright, or a Carpenter?

2. Why a Mason, for he buildes all of stone,
And will indure long.

Clowne. That's prety, too't agen, too't agen.

2. Why then a Carpenter, for he buildes the gallowes,
And that brings many a one to his long home.

Clowne. Prety agen, the gallowes doth well, mary howe
dooes it well? the gallowes dooes well to them that doe ill,
goe get thee gone:

And if any one aske thee hereafter, say,

A Graue-maker, for the houses he buildes

Last till Doomes-day. Fetch me a stope of beere, goe.

It is a curious typographical arrangement. Except for the first three lines of the First Clown's final speech, the lines preserve the blank-verse length, and each commences with a capital letter. Then something happens; the lines run right across the page, and the capitals vanish, until we come to the fourth line, when there is an abrupt return to the old arrangement. How are we to account for all this? Assuming, as I think we should, that the compositor was as usual following his copy, we must look to Voltemar for an explanation. And the hypothesis which appears to fit the facts best is that 'Goe fetch me a stope of drinke' was the last line on one side of a folio in the transcript, the next page beginning '*Enter Hamlet and Horatio*'; that Voltemar, writing his addition on the transcript itself, did his best to imitate the line-arrangement of the rest of the scene but was forced to depart from it for lack of space as he got near the foot of the page; and that the sudden return to the norm at the end of the addition denotes the point at

THE 'HAMLET' TRANSCRIPT, 1593. 237

which he continued at the head of the next folio. This specimen is important for two reasons. It brings the pirate and the shortened copy into close connexion, suggesting as it does that he actually made his additions on the body of the transcript. It proves also that he recognised the peculiarity of the prose line-division and attempted to conform to it. Such conformity would of course be far more difficult when he was touching up a passage which occurred in the middle of a folio page, and we can hardly suppose that he made a fair copy of any portions of the text for the sake of typographical uniformity. The specimen from the Nunnery scene, just dealt with, shows us that in such cases he simply wrote his additions in the margin. It is a fact which makes it sometimes difficult to decide between the claims of piratical and Shakespearian revision. But we cannot here embark upon a consideration of this difficult problem, upon which however a great deal hangs.

IV. DATE AND COMPANY.

THE original manuscript from which the transcript was made appears to have embodied at least three strata of dramatic composition. The latest material is that which corresponds most closely with the 1601 'Hamlet'; the oldest, those scenes in what we have called 'ur-Hamlet' verse, which are either very different, or entirely absent, from the final version. Between these two extremes we have a number of other scenes, mostly in prose, which have received considerable though less drastic

238 THE 'HAMLET' TRANSCRIPT, 1593.

alteration. To put the matter in another way, 'Hamlet' was probably first written by a dramatist rejoicing in the 'ur-Hamlet' style; his manuscript was later worked over by one or more other dramatists, possibly for a company which liked its prose in verse-lining; and lastly, Shakespeare, who may or may not have been concerned with the second stage, began a revision on his own account, a revision which, when the transcript came to be made, had not extended much beyond the Ghost-scenes. The partial, not to say interrupted, character of this revision makes it probable that its date and that of the transcript are very close to each other. On the other hand it is difficult to imagine that had Shakespeare been actually at work upon his manuscript he would have allowed it without protest to be transcribed in that condition and hawked round the provinces. If, therefore, we wish to date the transcript, the most suitable year would be one in which Shakespeare is known to have been absent from his company, and the company itself compelled to go on tour owing to the closing of the theatres.

There is external evidence for the existence of an early 'Hamlet' play. Nash refers to it in his preface to Greene's 'Menaphon' (1589), and Henslowe's Diary testifies to a 'Hamlet' performance on June 9th, 1594, by the Admiral's and Chamberlain's men at Newington Butts. It is, of course, possible that there were two dramas on the Hamlet theme. But it is more economical to posit a single play, a thesis which finds support in the connexion between Shakespeare's company and

the 1594 'Hamlet,' and in the fact that while Nashe attacked a 'Hamlet' dramatist, unnamed, in 1589, his friend Greene was openly hurling his invectives against Shakespeare in 1592. I suggested in my former article that the verse of the Ghost-scenes may have been written about ten years before the 1601 'Hamlet' appeared at the Globe. Now, if the drama to which Nashe refers in 1589 was taken from the parent manuscript, at the second stage of its development, and if the 1594 performance was taken from the same manuscript, at a later stage, these two dates would give us an upward and downward limit for Shakespeare's partial revision, and consequently for the transcript. But let us turn to the internal evidence.

It is well known that Q 1 contains an attack upon a clown, which is omitted in the authoritative text. It has not, however, been recognised that all three English texts give us a passage which seems to be directed against a particular company of players. As I have shown elsewhere the Play-scene possesses a comic underplot, in which the Gonzago-troupe, and in particular the First Player, are held up to ridicule as clumsy and flashy performers.¹ The climax of this comic underplot is reached in the phrase 'The croaking raven doth bellow for revenge,' which Hamlet shouts at the First Player as the latter makes his 'damnable faces.' Now, as Richard Simpson discovered, these words form a telescoped edition of two ranting lines from 'The True Tragedy of Richard III,' a

¹ The Play-scene in 'Hamlet' restored. (July, August, September, November, 1918, 'The Athenæum'.)

play belonging to the Queen's men and published in 1594. Is it possible to avoid the conclusion that it is the Queen's company which is satirised in the Play-scene? Such a conclusion would certainly fit in very strikingly with the attacks of Nashe and Greene, the latter of whom was, of course, a writer for the Queen's company. The 'True Tragedy' was probably an old play at the time of its publication, and the fortunes of the Queen's men began to go rapidly downhill from 1591 onwards. The jibe in 'Hamlet,' therefore, had lost all its topical point long before the beginning of the seventeenth century, though its mouth-filling quality and its subtle connexion with the whole theme of the Hamlet story fully justified its retention. Yet the remark must have been inserted into Hamlet's mouth before 1594, and there is something like an overwhelming probability that it was penned before Christmas 1591, the last occasion on which the Queen's men appeared at Court, after which no new plays are at all likely to have been written for that company. The 'croaking raven' passage, therefore, would seem to date parts of the Q 1 text as at latest 1591. This is startling enough; but, unless I am very much mistaken, the Clown passage pushes the text even further back still. The leading clown of the Queen's company was the renowned Tarlton, whose features many editors have recognised in the skull of Yorick. Q 1 mentions a 'cinquepace of jests' as belonging to the Clown whom Hamlet dislikes, jests of a particularly vapid character. It is a remarkable fact, hitherto unnoticed I believe,

that two of these five jests—'my coat wants a cullison' and 'your beer is sour'—are to be found, slightly varied, in 'Tarltons Jestes,' published in 1611.¹ It may perhaps be argued that the Q 1 attack was directed against one of Tarlton's successors who imitated the master-clown and spoilt his jokes in so doing. But if the 1611 publication represents in truth the fine flower of Tarlton's wit, readers of that volume will agree with me that no imitator could well be feebler than the model. Moreover, seeing that the other circumstances noted above all point to an attack upon Tarlton's company, it is only natural to suppose that he is the Clown pilloried in the 'cinquepace of jests' passage. But Tarlton died in September, 1588, after which a sneer at him would be, to say the least of it, old-fashioned. We are forced to conclude, therefore, that this portion of the Q 1 text goes back to some period before that date. And, if so, the 'croaking raven' passage belongs to the same period, since it is clearly part of the same dramatic lampoon. A 'Hamlet' in the late eighties caricaturing the Queen's company would give much point to Nashe's unkind references to a 'Hamlet' dramatist in 1589.

Whether Shakespeare was the dramatist in question is a matter which must be reserved for later consideration. Here it is sufficient to note that the two passages concerned were almost certainly not written at the time of the partial revision which gave us the Ghost-scenes of Q 1. They occur in

¹ Shakespeare Society's edition, 1844: 'How Tarlton plaid the drunkard before the Queen' (p. 5), and 'Tarlton's jest of a red face' (p. 12). The 1611 edition was apparently not the first.

the middle of the play, which there is evidence that Shakespeare had not revised before the transcript was made, and they form pieces of prose dialogue printed in blank-verse lengths, which, whatever be the meaning of this phenomenon, suggests an early date. In a word, I assign them to the second 'Hamlet' stratum, preceding the partial revision.

The natural date for a Shakespearian revision of a manuscript belonging to the late eighties is the early nineties, and I think that we shall not go far wrong if we attach it to the years 1591-2. As already remarked, the incomplete nature of the revision suggests that Shakespeare was temporarily absent from his company at the time when the transcript was made. Now we can be practically certain that Shakespeare was not with his company during most of 1593-4. The plague in 1593 was very bad, and the London theatres were closed at the beginning of February, after which the Strange men went into the provinces without Shakespeare, as we know from an extant list of the players which does not contain his name. Probably he was, as an actor, absent also in part or all of 1592, since his name does not occur among the actors in the 'Seven Deadly Sins' performed in March of that year, the plot of which is preserved at Dulwich. Nevertheless he was *writing* for his company at this time, since the Talbot scenes in 'I. Henry VI' were being performed in February, 1592. On the other hand, we find him mentioned in connexion with Christmas acting at Court by the Chamberlain men in 1594. It would appear from all this that

THE 'HAMLET' TRANSCRIPT, 1593. 243

Shakespeare was only loosely connected with his company during 1592, did not travel with them in 1593, and only rejoined them towards the end of 1594—during which period he was, as we know, engaged on the production of 'Venus and Adonis' and 'The Rape of Lucrece.' Such a break in his dramatic career would fit in admirably with the business of the interrupted revision and the transcript; the closing of the London play-houses for an indefinite period put a sudden stop to his work upon 'Hamlet,' the necessity for a lengthy tour in the provinces was the occasion of the transcription of the manuscript.

This is hypothesis, of course; but it can at least claim to be scientific. The theories of science take on the certainty of facts when they serve to explain not merely a single group of phenomena, but all groups of the same species. Now 'Hamlet' Q 1 belongs to a species, the species which Mr. A. W. Pollard has labelled as the Bad Quartos. These Bad Quartos include the first editions of 'Hamlet' (1603), 'Merry Wives' (1602), 'Henry V' (1600), and 'Romeo and Juliet' (1597). We saw on p. 234 that the prose-lining peculiarity suggested a common origin for three of these. I hope shortly to be able to show in another place that all four texts possess characteristics so strikingly similar that only a common history can explain them. One of these is the evidence pointing to incomplete Shakespearean revision of an old text. Another is furnished by clues which suggest the period 1591-2 for this revision. The date 1591, for example, is tamped upon 'Romeo and Juliet' Q 1 by the

famous earthquake reference. Equally famous is the 'cosen-garmombles' reference, not found in the F 1 text, which connects 'Merry Wives' Q 1 with the visit of Count Mumplegart to the English Court in the summer of 1592; and it was this early 'Wives,' as Mr. Fleay has conjectured, which was probably acted by Shakespeare's company at the Rose on January 5th, 1593, under the title of 'The Jealous Comedy.'¹ Lastly, there is at least the possibility of an early 'Henry V' play being put on the stage in connection with the English expeditionary force which was fighting for Navarre in France during the years 1591-2, more especially as the character of Flueilen bears a remarkable resemblance to Sir Roger Williams, one of its commanders.² In a word I believe that Shakespeare was working at all four plays when the plague interrupted him at the beginning of 1593, and that shortened transcripts were taken of his manuscripts for the Strange men's tour of that year.

Once we have established the existence of a shortened transcript behind one of the pirated texts, it is natural to suppose that the others were in a like case, while, in view of the date correspondences just noted, it is easiest to imagine that all the transcripts were made at the same time. The 1593 tour was an extensive one, including visits to Chelmsford, Bristol, Bath, Shrewsbury, and probably Chester, York and a number of other places. It began early in the spring of 1593, and appears

¹ 'Life of Shakespeare,' p. 112.

² See my 'Martin Marprelate and Shakespeare's Fluellen,' pp. 34-9. (Alex. Moring.)

THE 'HAMLET' TRANSCRIPT, 1593. 245

to have lasted into the late autumn, if not into the following year. The theatres in London were closed, and there was little hope of them being re-opened in the immediate future. In the whole history of Shakespeare's company no provincial tour is to be compared with this for duration and for the number of towns visited. Its exceptional character was indeed symbolised by the grant of a special licence from the Privy Council, dated May 6th, 1593, authorising the company to play in any town in the kingdom outside London.¹ The preparations for such a tour would be considerable, and the principal requisite would of course be acting-copy. The original manuscripts could hardly have been taken. They formed the company's chief capital, and the risk of loss or damage would have been too great. Moreover, their length made them unsuitable for the provincial stage. Under these circumstances the obvious thing to do was to have shortened copies prepared of a number or selected plays, one of which we cannot doubt was the partially revised 'Hamlet.'

The Privy Council licence gives us the names of the players engaged upon this expedition. They were Edward Alleyn, William Kemp, Thomas Pope, John Heminges, Augustine Phillipps, and George Bryan, while Richard Cowley probably joined them shortly after the tour had commenced. Of these Alleyn was a Lord Admiral's man, who doubtless played the chief tragic parts, and may, I think, have been useful in regard to the preparation of the transcripts. The rest were Strange men,

Tucker Murray 'English Dramatic Companies,' i, 87-8.

and their names are important in reference to the question of piracy. Voltemar was an actor who played in the 1601 'Hamlet.' The other Bad Quartos were also pirated. Is it likely that more than one of Shakespeare's company was involved in these shady proceedings? The transcripts would be of no use for the London play-house after the tour was over. What happened to them? We find one being used for a pirated edition in 1597, and the others re-appearing in the same fashion in 1600, 1602, and 1603. Is it not possible, nay probable, that the pirate was the same in all cases, and that he was one of the Strange men who went on the 1593 tour and managed to retain possession of the transcripts after his return?

* * * *

This brings us to the end of the first stage of our enquiry into the history of the 'Hamlet' text. The method pursued hitherto has been predominantly bibliographical; in the next stage it will have to be predominantly literary. The failure of previous critics to solve the problem of the First Quarto is due to their neglect of bibliographical considerations, which form the only secure and scientific basis for textual investigation. I am confident that the foundations here laid down will in the main stand the test of criticism. In a matter so complex, however, involving questions of Shakespearian biography and of Elizabethan stage-management, certain details of the argument will almost inevitably have to be modified in the light of the knowledge of other workers in the yet

THE 'HAMLET' TRANSCRIPT, 1593. 247

unharvested fields of Shakespearian study. In particular I would mention the puzzling problem of prose printed in blank-verse lengths, a key which I am convinced will open many doors, though its full significance still eludes me. Before proceeding therefore to the literary problems of the 'Hamlet' manuscript, I propose to make a pause, during which I invite help and criticism from other students. With their assistance it will be possible, I hope, to make the foundations so sound that the superstructure will stand the test of time. And, if so, we shall be in sight of a permanent solution of the greatest of all Shakespearian textual problems—the origin and history of the world's subtlest and most profound dramatic masterpiece.

J. DOVER WILSON.

NOTES ON OLD BOOKS.

'BRITANNIA'S PASTORALS.'



IT appears to be generally believed that Book I of Browne's 'Pastorals' was first published in 1613 in folio, that this is the edition which frequently accompanies the folio edition of Book II dated 1616, and that the text was still unaltered when 'the two books were reissued in an octavo volume in 1625.' This is evidently the view of Browne's editor in the 'Muses' Library,' and it is accepted in the 'Cambridge History.' The text of Book I printed in the 'Muses' Library' is that of the edition usually associated with the Book II of 1616, and probably belongs to the same year, though the original, undated, engraved title-page is retained. The text of this second (1616) edition is used in all the later reprints I have seen; it differs in many obvious features from that of the first (1613) edition. The pagination and signatures of the two editions are the same, but, in the second, A₃ is signed A₂, and this error is not found in the first. On the other hand, p. 108 is erroneously numbered 109 in the first edition, and is correctly paged in the second. The list of 'Faults escaped' printed on A₆ (reverse) in the first edition is omitted in the second, and the 'faults' have mostly been amended. Although only three years separate the two editions, the later text

has been much modernized throughout; silent letters frequently disappear; *hee* becomes *he*, *olde* becomes *old*, *yeeeres* becomes *yeres*, *noates* becomes *notes*, and a host of similar instances might be cited. The revision goes further than this, and is not always beneficial. The argument of the first song is, in the earlier version,

Marina's Love ycleep'd the faire
Celand's disdain, and her despaire,
Are the first wings whereby my song
Soares to the sacred Helicon.

but in the later version the last lines become

Are the first wings my Muse puts on
To reach the sacred Helicon.

Scarcely an improvement!

On p. 4,

My wretched life to thy betraying eyes?

is certainly an improvement on the earlier

My life (like Phaeton) to thy clearest eyes?

but on p. 8, the earlier

Why should I not affect this sweetest youth,
The very portraiture of naked truth
Who sav'd and loves, yet thou not lov'st nor sav'st
And offers faith indeede, which thou ne'er gav'st?

has been less happily changed to

Why had not I affected some kind youth
Whose everie word had beene the word of Truth?
Who might have had to love, and lov'd to have,
So true a Heart as I to Celand gave.

On p. 15 fourteen new lines are inserted in the later edition; on p. 49 two new lines appear, and also on p. 79. In conclusion, *Finis Libri primi* becomes in the second edition *The end of the first Booke*. There are many other alterations, but we need not labour the point; the two folio editions are quite distinct.

HUGH C. H. CANDY.

PLAYS AT CANTERBURY IN 1570.

LONG after Beckett's shrine had disappeared from Canterbury Cathedral, and the stream of 'pilgrims' had dried up, the city, lying as it did on the main road to Dover, continued to receive many and distinguished visitors. Ambassadors and statesmen were constantly passing through it on their way to and from the Continent. It abounded in old inns, which had been built to receive the pilgrims in days gone by; inns with spacious chambers, and great galleried courtyards.

It is not surprising then to find that in the days of Elizabeth, many companies of strolling players found their way to Canterbury and left it, let us hope, with well filled purses.

The following entries from the Account Books of the Chamberlain of the city for the year 1569-70, will serve as an illustration of the popularity of the stage in Canterbury at that time. In the early part of that year the Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports paid the city a visit in his character of Lord Lieutenant of the County and was entertained by the Mayor. Under the head of 'Forryn Expenses,' are these items:

Item paid to my Lord Wardens plaiors at y ^e	}	x ^s .
comandymnt of Mr. Maior		

252 PLAYS AT CANTERBURY IN 1570.

Item paid to my Lord Ritches plaiers at Mr.	} xiijs. iiijd
Maiores comandymnt and his brethren	
Item paid to my lord munges players at Mr.	} 10s.
Maiores and his brethrens comandymnt	
Item paid to my Lord of Lessetars playars at	} xiijs. iiijd
Mr. Maiores and his brethrens comandymnt	
Item paid to Syr thomas bernars players, Master	} xs.
of the Quenes maiesties Revells	
Item paid to Robert Betts paynter, for payntyng	} ijs.
and setting forth the portitned of ye Citte,	
to be shewyd to my lord of Canterburys grace,	
and for the clothe	

What was meant by the word 'portitned' in this last entry it is hard to guess, possibly 'portrait' is meant, although the price seems too small to warrant the suggestion.

Robert Betts had been carrying on his trade in Canterbury since the year 1560. He was not a freeman of the city and had to pay a tax of 4d. per year. The picture or whatever it was noticed above must have been almost his last work, as he died intestate shortly afterwards, and an inventory of his effects taken on the 31st October, 1571, was put into the Probate Court.¹ That he was not a rich man may be inferred from the fact that the total sum was only £8. 19. 2, while the debts due to the deceased amounted to upwards of six pounds. Amongst these debts was the following:

It[e]m William Fidge and Whetstone owe the said bettes for their portions in buyinge of certen playe-bookes. 35s. 4d.

No other books were mentioned in the inventory.

¹ Probate Office Canterbury, Inventories, Vol. vi, fol. 91.

PLAYS AT CANTERBURY IN 1570. 253

That these were not printed plays, is quite evident from the price. Sixpence was the average price of a copy of a play in the sixteenth century, and the only other explanation of the entry that suggested itself was that Fidge and Whetstone were actors, and that these were the manuscript parts of a play which Betts had written out and supplied them with. On this suggestion being submitted to Dr. W. W. Greg, he expressed the opinion that the explanation was quite reasonable.

There were three other entries in the inventory which are of interest in connection with that relating to the play-books. These consisted of sums of money due to the deceased painter for the board of three men named Richard Winter, John Singer and David Leeke. Although it does not expressly say so, there can be little doubt that these three men were also players. Indeed, the name of one of them, John Singer, was that of a well-known member of the Admiral's Company at the Rose Theatre. Collier in his 'English Dramatic Poetry' stated that Singer was a great popular favourite. Henslowe on the 13th January, 1602, paid him £5 for a play called 'Singer's Vollentarye,' and he is also credited with being the author of a book called 'Queps upon Questions.' But the earliest mention of him hitherto was 1594. If this was the same man, it is interesting to find him touring at Canterbury nearly quarter of a century earlier.

It is also conceivable that the Whetstone who figures in this inventory was George Whetstone the author, who is believed to have been born in 1544, and would therefore have been twenty-seven

years of age in 1571. In his early life he appears to have been a wild character and to have haunted gambling-houses and brothels, so that there is nothing improbable in his having associated himself with a company of players who were touring the country. But if it be the same man he must have left the company at Canterbury, as in 1572 he was serving as a soldier in the Low Countries. In after life he wrote a play called 'The right excellent and famous Historye of Promos and Cassandra,' but it was never acted.

Nothing appears to be known of the other three men, William Fidge, Richard Winter and David Leeke; nor is there anything to be gained by trying to conjecture to which, if any, of the companies which visited Canterbury they belonged. It is something to have unearthed their names, and time will perhaps reveal something more about this little band of strolling players.

HENRY R. PLOMER.

SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

THOSE who like occasionally to refresh their general knowledge of philosophers and philosophies will find interesting reading in 'Figures et doctrines de philosophes,'¹ a posthumous volume of essays by Victor Delbos, whose death at the age of 53 is greatly to be deplored. The essays, based on lectures delivered not to professional students but to a general audience, include studies of Socrates, Lucretius, Marcus Aurelius, Descartes, Spinoza, Kant, and Maine de Biran. In spite of the difference, or even of the opposing elements in their teaching, they all start from the same principles:

'qu'il y a une "nature humaine supérieure" qui s'offre comme modèle ou s'impose comme règle à notre nature humaine actuelle';

they all desired to teach men wisdom, and can still in different degrees assist us towards that noble end.

Delbos, perhaps, finds nothing very new to say, but his brief 'aperçus' are most helpful in consolidating the scattered knowledge that is all most of us who are not professional students of philosophy have attained. Especially valuable is the essay on Maine de Biran, whose work is less well known

¹ Plon-Nourrit. 1918.

256 SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

than that of his companions in the volume. Like Vauvenargues, Biran was no philosopher by profession. Born in 1766, from the time when at 19 years of age he entered the 'gardes du corps,' until his death in 1824, he took an active part in public life. He went much into society, and as deputy under two Restorations attended the sittings of the Chamber. But politics, at least the practical side of them, bored him. 'I spend 4 or 5 hours on end in the Chamber,' he writes,

'comme à un spectacle ennuyeux, suivant des yeux et de l'oreille un orateur, comme on suit les mouvements d'un danseur de corde, sans qu'aucune faculté de l'esprit soit exercée, souvent laissant errer mon imagination dans le vague. Cette vie n'est propre qu'à abêtir.'

He never spoke from the tribune himself because, as he put it, 'Je n'ai pas le talent de faire des phrases sans penser.' A man who declared 'je suis né pour spéculer plus que pour agir,' was not likely to make his way as a politician. But it is not the outward man in whom we are interested, it is 'l'homme intérieur' whom we find in his 'Journal intime,'¹ begun in 1794 and ended in 1824. Therein he records for himself alone, with no thought or intention of publication,

'ce qui le touchait, ce qui lui arrivait, ce qu'il concevait, l'état de sa santé, les événements du jour, les aperçus philosophiques';

¹ Large extracts were published by Ernest Naville in 'Maine de Biran, sa vie et ses pensées,' 1857; L'Abbé Mayjonade published 'Pensées et pages inédites de Maine de Biran,' 1916, where he gives extracts from the 'Journal' of 1815.

and, above all, 'ce qui se passe en moi.' His philosophy of life leaned to the side of the Stoics:

'L'art de vivre consisterait à affaiblir sans cesse l'empire ou l'influence des impressions spontanées par lesquelles nous sommes immédiatement heureux ou malheureux, à n'en rien attendre, et à placer nos jouissances dans l'exercice des facultés qui dépendent de nous.'

But in time this, too, he found insufficient and leaned to religion, and came to the conclusion that

'si l'homme, même le plus fort de raison, de sagesse humaine, ne se sent pas soutenu par une force, une raison plus haute que lui, il est malheureux. . . . La sagesse, la vraie force consiste à marcher en présence de Dieu, à se sentir soutenu par lui.'

By this he seems to have meant that there should be a life of the spirit dominating, but in no way abolishing, that of '*la vie simplement humaine.*'

Maine de Biran's system of philosophy will be caviare to the general, but those who sometimes like to delve into the history of a soul will find the study of a temperament which took 'pure conscience' to be the primitive and inalienable character of the true inner life absorbing enough. It is curious, too, to discover the likeness between Biran's conclusions, though he reached them by a different route, and those of Pascal. They certainly approach each other, as Delbos writes—

'dans la découverte des conditions et des motifs psychologiques de la foi, c'est dans l'investigation des causes profondes qui empêchent l'homme de se suffire et l'obligent à aller jusqu'au Dieu du Christianisme pour mettre en sûreté l'objet de ses tendances les plus indestructibles et de ses plus invincibles espérances.'

258 SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

Denys Cochin's 'Louis-Philippe'¹ ends with the following words from a letter of Wellington to Lamartine: 'Quand la France et l'Angleterre seront d'accord pour donner la paix au monde, personne ne pourra la troubler impunément.' When that page was passed for press the Allies were still at war with Germany. Now,² it looks as if Wellington's words were to be realized. M. Cochin modestly states that he attempts in his volume not to write the history but 'dessiner la figure' of the prince, who at 35 years of age had seen 'la cour de Versailles, la Terreur, les guerres, l'essor prodigieux de l'Empire de Napoléon.' His chequered career is broadly sketched as are the influences that moulded his mind. Cochin compares him with the great Mirabeau, referring to the passage in 'Les Girondins,' where Lamartine points out how Mirabeau alone, when what had been built up and cemented by the ages fell in a few months, stood firm on his feet:

'Là où tout le monde tâtonne, il touche, il marche droit. Il aborde, il tranche toutes les questions, non en utopiste, mais en politique. La solution qu'il apporte est toujours la moyenne exacte entre l'idéal et la pratique. Il met la raison à la portée des mœurs, et les institutions en rapport avec les habitudes. Il veut un trône pour appuyer la démocratie; il veut la liberté dans les Chambres, et la volonté de la Nation, unie et irrésistible dans le Gouvernement.'

In addition, 'justesse' and common sense, rather than audacity, are the characteristics of his genius.

¹ Hachette. 1918.

² December, 1918.

Such are the qualities and opinions that, in Cochin's opinion, belong also to Louis-Philippe. In lively interesting fashion Cochin recounts his hero's many and varied adventures, and describes the tortuous politics of the time so far as they concerned Louis-Philippe. As a constitutional monarch, he was admirable, for he always acted up to his conviction that in the constitutional monarchy France possessed 'les moyens assurés de satisfaire à tous les intérêts moraux et matériels' of the country. But all the same he had to go like Louis XVIII in 1815 and Charles X in 1830. He abdicated and fled to England, where he arrived in such poverty that Lord Aberdeen and Sir Robert Peel slipped a note of £1,000 into the hands of M. de Jarnac, chargé d'affaires at the French embassy, London, for the immediate relief of the ex-king. Truly, as we have witnessed for ourselves in these latter days, the falls of princes, good and bad alike, are instructive events. Yet, as M. Cochin points out, France has known more than one 'grand siècle,' and over some of those great ages a king has presided:

'La France de Saint Louis, la France de Louis XIV, la France de 1789, la France de Napoléon éblouissait tour à tour le monde et se faisait oublier l'une, l'autre, comme si, à chacune de ces renaissances, toute l'Histoire de France eût commencé. Aujourd'hui toutes les gloires revivent, et toutes les traditions s'unissent.'

In 'Le Serviteur,'¹ Henri Bachelin has produced a beautiful book, and one we may all do well to

¹ Flammarion. 1918.

260 SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

ponder. He calls it a novel, though of plot, intrigue, character development, easy dialogue, it is innocent. In apostrophising his dead father, as he does throughout, Bachelin, with perfect art and in exquisite prose, describes the existence of a man of the 'menu peuple' whose influence has in France, as elsewhere, always been too much ignored; a man who, as peasant, workman and servant, honest, conscientious, religious, performed to the best of his ability the work that lay to his hand, paid his way, and was never troubled by 'idées de révolte.' Undoubtedly, the winning of the war is in large measure due to such citizens in all the allied countries.

We are apt to call people like the hero of this book dull, and some of my readers will find the narrative dull; others, without being reactionaries, or too exclusively praisers of past times, will recognize the worth of men, the lives of whom look grey to the casual observer, but who have themselves realized that

'nous devons connaître chacun nos limites, et que ce n'est point se résigner à la médiocrité que d'être satisfait de cultiver seulement son propre jardin sans convoiter celui du voisin,'

and who claimed 'ni le partage des biens, ni le bouleversement de la société.' The life of a humble man in a little township is described through all the hours of the day, and the seasons of the year; he loved his work, and met the duties of each day with glad resignation. His expenditure for himself and his wife in 1901 was exactly £38, yet he felt that

SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS. 261

with that sum they would not die of hunger, and were not to be pitied, that there were many who were less fortunate. Bachelin pays a fine tribute to a class of men who have from the earliest times helped to make France what she is. They spent their lives in their villages or their little towns undisturbed by 'les cris des fêtes' or 'les clameurs révolutionnaires des grandes cités.' It would seem that the old order is passing away. Education, improved means of rapid communication, the claim of equality in all things, the desire for material comfort, the inventions of science, are all tending to do away with the grand simplicity of life and thought of such persons as Bachelin describes. It may be that these 'serviteurs' are after all the true socialists:

'Vous avez été les ouvriers de la première heure: que du moins à la douzième vous puissiez vous asseoir à la table du Père!'

As we read these short and simple annals of the poor we are reminded of Gray's 'Elegy,' for 'Le Serviteur' in the same way describes those who 'Along the cool sequester'd vale of life, kept the noiseless tenour of their way.' The exquisitely drawn miniatures of rural scenes that are scattered through the book might well make companion pictures to those in Gray's poem. As examples, let us take the two following pictures:

'C'est ici, entre la maison et le champ, que tu as vécu trente années de la vie.

'De bonne heure tu avais pris l'habitude de ne point flâner au lit, hiver comme été levé avant les poules

262 SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

C'était toi qui leur ouvrais la porte. Elles saluaient leur délivrance en jacassant comme des femmes. Je ne suis pas sûr que tu n'aies jamais causé avec elles. Nous ne craignons pas les incursions des renards, mais il y avait d'autres renards qui, la nuit, ne se gênaient guère pour ouvrir avec leurs mains les portes des poulaillers. Alors tu comptais nos poules. Elles défilaient devant toi comme à la parade.'

'Un clair de lune admirable s'étendait sur le cimetière, sur la ville, sur la plaine, sur les bois et sur les montagnes; un de ces clairs de lune comme on en voit en septembre par les étés chauds, qui font croire que les champs moissonnés à ras de terre sont couverts de neige.

'C'était une de ces nuits où la pensée ne peut que s'éparpiller en rêves.'

In 'Histoires héroïques de mon ami Jean,'¹ Abel Hermant has produced an attractive war story. A native of Paris, the child of a dealer in antiquities, whose shop stood on the quay, the boy loved to watch the Seine flowing ceaselessly beneath his window, and this made him ponder the instability of the universe. In addition he was accustomed to a similar instability in the furniture of his bedroom which was only stored there until his father sold it, and it was then replaced by other antiques. In August, 1914, returning from a walk he saw on the shutters of the shop the notice 'Closed until the end of the war.' His father had been called up and thought hostilities would only last three months. But when four months had passed, his mother took down the notice and proceeded to carry on the

¹ Flammarion. 1918.

business. Hermant traces with great skill the effect of all that was happening on the mind of a sensitive, undeveloped boy, backward for his age, who was nearly fifteen in August, 1914. His father is killed, and then Jean's whole spirit is bent on enlistment at once in order to avenge his father's death; he felt that he had a private duty besides that common to all Frenchmen—he had his own account to settle with the enemy. We follow Jean through his training, his experiences in the front line, in billets, on leave, in hospital, his promotion to the rank of sergeant, until he is drowned while bathing, just as any civilian might have been.

'Telle fut la mort de mon ami Jean, un des soldats de la guerre, pareil à des centaines de milliers d'autres, un gamin—si tendre!—malicieux, qui faisait son devoir en souriant, et qui n'eut pas le temps de faire le mal.'

The charm of the book lies in the vein of humour that runs through it, humour that is mostly very close to pathos, and to the delicacy of touch with which the artist has painted the portrait of his hero, the portrait, be it said, of thousands of young men to whose courage, unselfishness, and high sense of duty we owe the glorious victory we have won.

A collection of small quarto volumes entitled 'L'Art et les Saints' promises to be both useful and pleasing. So far as I know, nothing quite like it has before been issued. I have often found it very difficult in the course of my own work to discover any simple unbiassed history of a saint, and an account of the chief works of art his or her life has

Laurens.

264 SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

inspired. The volumes before me deal with St. Nicholas, St. Catherine of Alexandria, St Geneviève, and St. Martin of Tours. Auguste Marguillier, l'abbé Henri Brémond, l'abbé A.-D. Sertillanges, and Henry Martin, all men of note and practised writers, are respectively responsible for the biographies. The most interesting at the present moment, perhaps, is the life of St. Geneviève, the patron saint of Paris. We all recall with pleasure the beautiful frescoes by Puvis de Chavannes in the Panthéon of Paris, illustrating her career, especially the wonderful moonlight picture in which she is watching over Paris. In fact, nearly all the works of art representing her are by French hands, for this

‘Vierge franche, de France née
Vierge de grâce enluminée’

is rooted in the hearts of the French, especially of the masses. St. Martin, the famous bishop of Tours, is likewise very popular with the French. He was a soldier, and the son of a soldier, and may be regarded as the national saint of France. He had a contemporary biographer, Sulpicius Severus, and thus we are able to trace his career with fair certainty. Though born in Pannonia in 317, and of Slave origin, the chief events of his life occurred in France. At the age of 15 he enlisted in the militia, and it was when in garrison at Amiens that he gave half of his cloak to a poor beggar he met by the way. That legend is known to all, but we do not always remember that St. Martin's summer is connected with him. His fête day is the 11th November, and coming at the end of agricultural activities,

SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS. 265

when there often occurs a series of fine mild days, gave the name of the saint to the period.

St. Catherine of Alexandria, the only inhabitant of paradise who has three aureols: white—of virgins; green—of learned doctors; red—of martyrs, whom poets call *gemma virginum*, reminds us at once of the world's greatest painters, Memling, Masaccio, Luini, Pinturicchio, Correggio, Rubens, Van Eyck, Titian, Filippo Lippi, Murillo, Tintoretto, Andrea del Sarto, who took subjects from her life for their finest pictures. Her story is delightfully set forth by Henri Brémond who has delved into all the old sources of her legend. He describes the mystic marriage with Christ, the disputation with the fifty learned doctors whom she promptly confounded, the miracle of the wheel, her final martyrdom by decapitation, and her burial by the angels on Mount Sinai. She was, too, the saint who with St. Margaret appeared to Joan of Arc.

These brief yet scholarly records should prove both useful and popular, and might well be reproduced in an English version.

* * * *

The following recently published books deserve attention:

La Couleur: choix de textes précédés d'une étude. Par Henri Guerlin. Le Dessin: choix de textes précédés d'une étude. Par Henri Guerlin. (Laurens.)

These two books belong to a series entitled 'L'Art enseigné par les maîtres,' a collection of passages on the

IX

T

266 SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS.

technique of the Arts, showing what has been written, said and thought by artists and authors from the elder Pliny to Rodin. The English artists or writers quoted include Hogarth, Reynolds, Ruskin, Whistler and Wilkie.

Enfantines. Par Valéry Larbaud. (Nouvelle Revue Française.)

Clever studies of children and the childish mind. The author is engaged on the translation of the works of Samuel Butler.

Un cousin d'Alsace. Par Edmond Sée. (Flammarion.)

A war novel illustrating the Alsatian's love of his 'petite patrie.'

Le Théâtre pendant la Guerre. Par Adolphe Brisson.

A collection of articles published in 'Le Temps' from December, 1914, to January, 1918. Very few new plays were produced, but the old classical plays and many modern plays of worth had a great success. During the period performances were given of 'The Merchant of Venice' and of 'Anthony and Cleopatra.'

Frédéric Mistral, poète, moraliste, citoyen. Par Pierre Lasserre.

An admirable study of Mistral's work in all its aspects.

Une politique coloniale. Le salut par les colonies. Par Lucien Hubert. (Alcan.) 4 fr. 55.

A statement of the essential basis on which the future colonial policy of France should be founded. As senator, Hubert has, in and out of the 'Parlement,' devoted himself for twenty years to the question of French Colonies.

SOME RECENT FRENCH BOOKS. 267

La vitalité économique de la France avant et après la guerre. Par F. Sauvaire-Jourdan. (Alcan.) 4 fr. 55.

Lectures given at Bordeaux, in the university of which the author is professor of political economy, on 'les forces productrices,' such as agriculture, industry, on banks and credit, on foreign trade, and on Colonies.

ELIZABETH LEE.

REVIEW.

Bibliografía Ibérica del Siglo xv. Segunda parte.
 Por *Conrado Haebler*. *Hiersemann, Leipzig*;
Nijhoff, La Haya, 1917. pp. ix. 258. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ in.

THE new volume of the standard bibliography of Spanish incunabula is separated from its predecessor by a period of thirteen years, and so much additional information on the subject has accumulated during this interval that Dr. Haebler is justified in putting 'Second Part' rather than 'Supplement' on his title page. The total number of previously unregistered editions here added to the 720 items of the original volume is no less than 166 and besides this about two-thirds of the old descriptions have been emended or supplemented in one way or another, mostly by a note of the whereabouts of further copies. The fresh descriptions are intercalated in the alphabetical list so as to leave space for still further accessions in the future; thus between the old numbers 169 and 170 we find two new books marked 169 (5) and 169 (10) respectively. The original brief lists of each printer's productions are now entirely superseded by the comprehensive 'cuadros sinópticos' occupying the last 58 pages; these include a list of types with their M-forms and

references to facsimiles, of woodcut capitals and of devices, and show at a glance as to each book whether it contains the name of the place and the printer, whether it has signatures and foliation, how many leaves it comprises, what are its types, etc. These lists are an excellent example of up-to-date bibliographical practice and add greatly to the value of Dr. Haebler's work.

The main source of the new accessions is the material collected by Dr. Ernst of Hildesheim during a journey to Spain undertaken for the German Incunabula Commission in 1909-10. About one half of the total of 166 is thus accounted for. A certain number of the remainder are taken from the descriptions in Dr. Reichling's Appendices to Hain, almost all of which were made from copies in various Italian libraries. It is of course, a good thing that a detailed record of so many editions previously unknown should be thus freely available, but there is no denying the fact that no such high authority attaches to the work of Dr. Haebler's two collaborators as to that of Dr. Haebler himself. The rest of the fresh information is mainly due to native investigators, notably Messrs. J. M. Sánchez, M. Jiménez Catalán and S. Sanpere Miguel, the last named of whom has been specially successful in unearthing from various records the titles of several editions which are not now known to survive even in a single copy. It is, however, to a French scholar, Father A. Lambert, that the most remarkable discovery of all is due,¹ throwing as it

¹ See his article in the *Bulletin Hispanique* of 1910.

does important new light upon the problems connected with the first introduction of printing into Spain.

While Valencia has generally been accepted as the first Spanish city to possess a printing office, on the evidence of the *Comprehensorium* completed there on 23 February, 1475, there has always been recognised to be a disturbing factor in the shape of N. Antonio's statement that he had seen a copy of a Catalan translation of Valascus de Tarenta's pamphlet on the plague produced in the same year at Barcelona. As far back as 1899 Sr. Serrano y Morales published a number of documents from Valencian archives which showed that the printing establishment at Valencia owned by a German merchant named Jacobus Vizland was broken up in consequence of the plague early in the second half of 1475, leaving unfinished certain work already in hand for the completion of which a consignment of paper had been ordered at Genoa. To this evidence must now be added that contained in the colophon of a Perottus, *Rudimenta grammatices*, discovered by Father Lambert in Saragossa Cathedral library, which runs as follows: '*Hoc opus grammaticae ex piratarum rapinis in Barcinonis littore expositum: cum Iohannes Peyronus serenissimi Aragonum Regis secretarius . . . ac alii quidam litterati homines legissent: maxime admirati a Iohanne de Salsburga & Paulo de Constantia Germanis: qui tum ibi forte aderant imprimi curarunt . . . Quod fuit perfectum pridie Idus Decembris anno . . . M.CCCC.LXXV.*' What was the remarkable 'chance' which brought these two craftsmen to Barcelona in 1475? It

was, according to Father Lambert, in all likelihood the very same attack of plague which compelled Vizland to abandon his enterprise at Valencia, John of Salzburg and Paul of Constance—the latter evidently identical with the Paul Hurus de Constantia who worked at Saragossa from 1481 (1485) onwards—being two of Vizland's employees who fled from Valencia to Barcelona to escape the epidemic. There can be no doubt that this theory is a very plausible one and if we follow Dr. Haebler in accepting it the controversy concerning the typographical primacy of Valencia and Barcelona is definitely decided in favour of the former, for the Perottus carries with it the Barcelona Valascus vouched for by Antonio. In point of fact, there is every reason for carrying the beginning of Vizland's press well back into the year 1474, for Dr. Haebler's lists show its known output to amount to very nearly 600 folio and about 270 quarto pages, so that one of its productions, the 'Obras y trobes', may easily have gone to press immediately after 25th March, 1474, the date of the poetical contest from the entries for which it is compiled. Whether Lambert Palmart should continue to be accepted as the first printer at Valencia it is hard to say; at any rate there seems to be no direct evidence to connect him with Vizland's ill-starred enterprise, his name first occurring in the Aquinas, Tertia pars Summae, with which the use of Vizland's type was revived and the interrupted series of Valencian incunabula resumed on 18th September, 1477. It should be pointed out that the type of the Barcelona Perottus, a roman letter of about 110 mm. to 20

lines, differs from that employed in the earliest Valencian books; both, however, show a decided affinity with Neapolitan and Roman models.

While there is nothing else equal to Father Lambert's discovery in interest, several further items deserve a word of mention. The most remarkable is the *Constituições do sinodo do Porto*, completed 'in porto ciuitate' by Rodrigo Alvarez on 4th January, 1497, in virtue of which Oporto takes rank among the printing centres of the fifteenth century. The only copy at present known is in the Oporto Municipal Library and lacks the colophon, a transcript of which is supplied from another copy available in 1892. In his description of a *Saragossa Manual*, sine nota, now at Berlin, Dr. Haebler argues learnedly to prove that it was produced at Hija, in the diocese of Saragossa, by Alfonso Fernandez de Cordoba about the year 1486. Similarly, two Hebrew incunabula are conjecturally assigned to Montalban and the year 1482. If this is correct the towns of Hija and Montalban must be added to the lists as new comers. A *Breuiarium Hieronymitanum* of 7th September, 1499, puts back by five months the beginning of the press of Georgius Coci and his partners at Saragossa, while the *Paschale Sedulii* completed by Rosenbach at Tarragona on 7th February, 1500, is almost eight months later than any book of his previously described and shows that the *Breuiarium Elsnense* printed by him at Perpignan in 1500 cannot well belong to the early part of that year. Two other books would respectively advance Henricus Botel at Lérida from 1495 to 1498 and take back Johannes

Gherlinc at Monterey from 1496 to 1488, but in each case the evidence is far from conclusive. Leonardus Hutz and Lupus Sanz at Salamanca, whose only dated books previously recorded belonged to January and February, 1496, must now be also credited with the first edition of the *Leyes del Estilo*, completed on 10th February, 1497. Owing to a confusion by Dr. Ernst this book is enumerated twice over by Dr. Haebler, once under the 'segundo grupo' of Salamanca printers (no. 350/5) and again in its proper place (no. 357/12). It is correctly described from the British Museum copy by Dr. Henry Thomas in no. 2 of his 'Bibliographical Notes' published in the 'Revue Hispanique,' and a number of errors in Dr. Ernst's description (no. 350/5) should be emended accordingly:—

2^a. ¶ Aquí comienzan las leyes del estilo . . .
 31^a. COLOPHON: Fin. || DEO GRACIAS . . . 31^b.
 ¶ Comienza la tabla de todas las leyes || que eneste libro se contienen. || . . . 36^a, col. 1, END: ¶ Ley cclii. quando alguno faze algun || delicto por mandado de su señor como se || libra. 36^b, blank.

In his first volume Dr. Haebler expressed the opinion that the *Almanach perpetuum* of Zacuthus with a colophon setting forth that it was printed by Abraham Dortas at Leiria in 1496 was not really a Leiria book at all but a Venetian edition with a false colophon. This view he has now given up. Quite a number of copies, it may be mentioned, have

¹ The number in question of the 'Revue' is apparently in process of distribution at the time of writing, but Dr. Thomas's article had then been in print for a considerable time.

latterly come to light in various Spanish and Portuguese libraries.

A few addenda and corrigenda remain to be set out. (1) In the article quoted above Dr. Thomas says that, besides the copy of the *Leyes del estilo*, copies of *Capitulos de gobernadores* (no. 117), *Ordenanças reales* (no. 223) and *Leyes por la brevedad de los pleitos* (no. 357) exist in the British Museum bound up among a collection of Spanish legal MSS. Dr. Haebler stated in his first volume that a copy of the *Capitulos* (Pegnitzer and Herbst, Seville, 1500) was in the Museum, but there is no other copy there save that just referred to 'and as Haebler did not know of the other incunabula in this set, he can hardly have known of this copy. There must have been in his note some confusion with the edition printed by Juan de Porras (no. 118), of which the only known copy is in the British Museum.' (2) There is a discrepancy between the quiring given by Dr. Haebler and that obtained from the British Museum copy in the case of Diaz de Montalvo, *Compilacion de leyes*, printed at Huete in 1484 (no. 214). The Museum copy gives 265 leaves, of which 1, 2, 161 (q 8), 229 (u 8) and the last three are blank, and the quiring works out as follows: (6); a b¹⁰ c¹⁰⁺¹ d-h¹⁰; i l-n¹⁰ o O⁸; p¹⁰ q⁸; r s S¹⁰ t¹² T⁸; v¹⁰ u⁸; x y¹⁰ I z⁸. Of the blanks only ff. 2 and 161 are preserved. (3) The *Phalaris, Epistulae*, belonging to the first Valencia group (no. 546/8) is complete in 52 leaves, not in 54, as stated by Dr. Ernst. The text begins on 1^a and ends on 48^b, the table begins on 49^a (*Incipit tabula sup Epistolas huius libri et vna || queqz*

epistola in presenti tabula cum sua poniñ || rubrica . . .) and ends on 51^b (. . . et Himerenses om̃s), leaf 52 being blank. Quiring: 8, 10, 8, 10, 8, 8. The type-page gradually increases in breadth from 77 to 83 mm. and this, together with the general appearance of the book, suggests a quite early place in the sequence for it. Its archetype is evidently U. Han's earliest edition (B.M. IA. 17240).

VICTOR SCHOLDERER.

NOTE.

THE editorial responsibility for the work known as the 'Travels of Sir John Mandeville' is not yet entirely settled. The respective share taken by the Liégois notary, Jean des Preis, or D'Outremeuse and his fellow-townsmen, the physician—Bearded John of Burgundy, is still a matter for discussion.

In the Catalogue of the Public Library of Amiens there is a small piece of evidence which is perhaps relevant and has so far been overlooked.

Among the manuscripts described in the Catalogue is a fifteenth century French version of the 'Travels' attributed as usual to Sir John Mandeville, and containing the description of his encounter at Liège and recognition of 'uns venerable homme et discret, maistre Johans a la Barbe, phisechiens.' Immediately after the 'Explicit' of the 'Travels' we find: 'Chy comenche le lapidare maistre Johans a la Barbe'; while the 'explicit' at the end of the whole codex runs: Chis libre est appelleis le Livre Johans de Mande Ville, chevalier qui fut fait, escrit, compileit et extrais hors d'unne aultre en la ville de Hotton, par le main Lambert le clers, pour et on nom de mon très

vaillant et très honoréis signour mon damoysiaux Lovuy, signeurs de Rochefort et d'Agymont etc., sur l'an de graace de la sainte nativiteit Nostre Seigneur Jhesu Christe milhe quatre cens et sissante et unck, en moy de may, etc.¹

No doubt the 'Lapidaire' in this manuscript must be the work usually bearing the name of Sir John Mandeville. The 'Lapidaire' is mentioned among Mandeville's writings in the death-bed story recounted by Jean des Preis in the 'Myreur de Histore,'² and the French version has been printed several times.³

Thus we find in the 'incipit' of the 'Lapidaire' in this manuscript, a reputed work of Sir John Mandeville, though not the 'Travels,' attributed to the physician, Jean à la Barbe. At the same time the 'explicit' to the whole manuscript suggests that both 'Travels' and 'Lapidaire' are the work of Sir John Mandeville.

It will therefore be seen that the manuscript supplements the already-known evidence that in the fifteenth century Sir John Mandeville and John à la Barbe were regarded as one and the same person.

DOROTHEA WALEY SINGER.

¹ E. Coyecque, 'Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques de France.' Départements. Tome XIX. Amiens.

² See S. Bormans in 'Bibliophile Belge,' I, p. 236, Brussels, 1866, and S. Bormans, 'Chronique et geste de Jean des Preis dit d'Outremeuse,' Vol. I, Intr. p. cxxxii *seq.*, Brussels, 1887.

³ 'Le Lapidaire en francoys' compose par Messire jehan de Mandeville ? Lyons ? 1531; Paris, Alain Lotrian; s.l.et.d. probably before 1580; and 'Le Grand Lapidaire,' Paris, 1561. This latter edition was republished with notes by Y. del Sotto, 'Le Lapidaire du quatorzième siècle. Description des pierres précieuses et de leurs vertus magiques d'après le traité du Chevalier Jean de Mandeville,' Vienna, 1862.

INDEX.

- Actor-pirates of Shakespeare's plays, 154 *sqq.*, 167-78, 226.
- Adams, C. F., his assertion that Milton found no early readers in America, 15.
- Aitken, P. H., finds all the water-marks of the first Oxford book in use in 1468, 93.
- Alington, W., victim of the Widow Edith, 191; his will, 197.
- American printing, its range restricted by importation of books from England, 16 *sq.*
- Anthony, Saint, allusion to in Heywood's plays, 51 *sq.*
- Author's copy, no case known of its surviving the Elizabethan printers' hand, 218.
- Autin, Albert, notice of his 'L'Échec de la Réforme en France au XVI^e siècle', 134 *sq.*
- Bale, Bishop, his use of 'edidit' of authorship, 126, 128.
- Barcelona, printing at (1475), 270.
- Bataille, Henri, his 'Écrits sur le Théâtre' noticed, 65 *sqq.*
- Boston, Mass, its booksellers grew rich, 7; first book-catalogue published at, 9.
- Bourdillon, F. W., on a lost edition of 'Theseus de Cologne', 73-83.
- Bourget, Paul, his novel 'Némésis' noticed, 205 *sqq.*
- Brackets, significance of in Shakespeare Quartos and First Folio, 161.
- Bréhier, Louis, his 'L'Art Chrétien' noticed, 132 *sqq.*
- Brewster, William, of New England, his books, 4 *sq.*
- Browne, William, the first edition of his 'Britannia's Pastorals', 248.
- Brudermord, Der bestrafte, German version of 'Hamlet,' its importance for history of 'Hamlet' text, 218 *sqq.*
- Byrne, M. St. Clair, on date of Anthony Munday's journey to Rome, 106-15.
- Candy, H. C. H., on the first edition of Browne's 'Britannia's Pastorals', 248.
- Canterbury, plays acted at (1570), 251.
- Collier, J. Payne, mistakes as to Munday's visit to Rome, 108 *sq.*
- Compendious Examination of certain ordinary Complaints, *see* Discourse.
- Cornyshe, William, plays wrongly attributed to, by Dr. Wallace, 122 *sqq.*; his lament 'Truth and Information,' 124 *sq.*
- Cox, E. Marion, note on Poole's 'English Parnassus' (1657) 215 *sq.*
- Crane, Ellery, on scarcity of books in New England, 1.
- Debates, dramatic, no decisions reached in Heywood's, 41 *sq.*
- Dickson, Frederick S., on Errors and omissions in 'Tom Jones,' 18-26.
- Dimier, Louis, his lectures on Bossuet and Descartes, 200 *sqq.*
- Discourse of the Commonwealth of England (printed 1581, as 'A Compendious Examination of certain Complaints,' or 'A Briefe Concept of English Pollicy'), note on its authorship, 84-87.

- Dudley, Thomas, of New England, list of his books, 3.
- Dunton, John, experiences as a bookseller in new England, 7.
- Durtain, Luc, notice of his war-idyll, 'Lise,' 210 *sq.*
- Edidit, Bale's use of, 126, 128.
- Eliot, Jacob, his copy of Burton's 'Anatomy,' 13.
- England, Discourse on the Commonwealth of, note on its authorship, 84-87
- Feuillerat, Albert, on the authorship of the 'Discourse on the Commonwealth of England,' 84-87.
- French Literature, notices by Elizabeth Lee of Some Recent French Books, 58-72, 132-149, 200-214, 255-269. its moral attitude, 204.
- Fielding, Henry, paper on 'Errors and Omissions in 'Tom Jones,' by F. S. Dickson, 18-26.
- Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, the Widow Edith's flight from, 190.
- Four Elements, interlude of, authorship assigned to John Rastell, 126 *sqq.*
- Haebler, Konrad, his 'Bibliographia Iberica del siglo xv,' Part 2, reviewed, 268.
- Hales, John, probable author of the 'Discourse of the Commonwealth of England,' 85.
- Hall, W., owner of Bodleian copy of Ovid's 'Metamorphoses' with Shakespeare signature, 97-103.
- Hawkins, John, father of the 'Widow Edith,' not the printer of 1530, 186.
- Herrick, C. A., paper on The Early New Englanders: What did they read? 1-17.
- Heywood, John, papers by A. W. Reed on the Canon of his Plays, 27-57, 116-31.
- Hijar, printing at in fifteenth century, 272.
- Hurus, Paul, de Constantia, printer at Barcelona (1475), 270 *sq.*
- Indulgences, scandal of, satirized in the 'Four P P,' 119 *sq.*
- Jean à la Barbe, note on his connection with Mandeville's Travels, 275.
- John of Salzburg, printer at Barcelona (1475,) 271.
- Kirkman, Francis, his list of Heywood's plays, 28-34.
- Lambert, A., discovery as to early Spanish printing, 270.
- Lee, Elizabeth, on Some Recent French Books, 58-72, 132-49, 200-14, 255-67.
- Lee, Samuel, the catalogue of his books (1693), the first published in Boston, 9.
- Leiria, Almanach printed at, (1496), 273.
- Madan, Falconer, on 'Two Lost Causes' (printing in Oxford in 1468 and the Shakespeare Signature in the Bodleian Ovid), 89-105.
- Mandeville, Sir John, note on authorship of the travels, 275.
- Masson, Pierre, notice of his letters, 142 *sq.*
- Mather, Richard, exceptional narrowness of his library, 4.
- Medwall, Henry, date of his death. 123 note.
- Mercers' Company, makes John Heywood 'Comen Mesurer,' 130.
- Middleton, William, his edition of the 'Four P P,' 34 *sq.*, 37 *sqq.*
- Milton, John, early American references to, 15.

- Misprints in 'Hamlet' quartos, their significance, 166 *sqq.*
- Montalban, printing at in 15th century, 272.
- More, Sir Thomas, his 'Mery jest of a sergeant who would learne to play the frere,' 53-55.
- More, Sir Thomas, the Widow Edith at his house, 191, *sqq.*
- Mumpelgart, Count, original of Cosen Garmombles in Shakespeare's 'Merry Wives,' 244.
- Munday, Anthony, date of his journey to Rome, 106-115; his Verses in Hakluyt's 'Voyages,' 113.
- N. T. (T. Nash), note in Bodleian Ovid purporting to be written by, 97-103.
- New Englanders, paper on what the early New Englanders read, by C. A. Herrick, 1-17.
- New Plymouth Registry of Wills, 1633-54, books mentioned in, 2 *sq.*
- Notes on Old Books, 84-7, 215-16, 248-50.
- Nut-Brown Maid, its metre used by Sir T. More, 54.
- Oliver, Peter, accused Early New-Englanders of contempt for literature, 1.
- Oporto, printing at in 15th century, 272.
- Ossian, influence in France, 65.
- Ovid's Metamorphoses, (Aldus 1502), authenticity of 'Shakespeare' signature in Bodleian copy of, not impossible, 97-105.
- Oxford, the impossibility of the date '1468' for the introduction of printing there still not proven, 90-97.
- Parkman, Ebenezer, of New England, books read by, 11 *sq.*
- Pirate-Actors of Shakespeare's plays, 154 *sqq.*, 167-78; 226.
- Plomer, H. R., on plays acted at Canterbury (1570), 251.
- Pollard, A. W., suggestions as to 'Hamlet' text, 164, 219.
- Poole, Josua, note on his 'English Parnassus' (1657), 215 *sq.*
- Printing, temporary discontinuance of, in various towns in 15th century, 92.
- Prose printed in blank-verse lengths in Elizabethan plays, 232-235.
- Provincial performances, plays of Shakespeare abridged for, 219 *sqq.*
- Punctuation, Shakespearean, difference, systems in good quartos and First Folio, 158; its detective value, 159 *sq.*, 171.
- Pynson, Richard, his dealings with John Rushe, 150-52.
- Ramuz, C. F., his 'Cahiers Vaudois' noticed, 67 *sq.*
- Rastell, John, author of the interlude of the 'Four Elements,' 126 *sqq.* his abortive voyage to 'the new found land,' 127.
- Rastell, William, his editions of John Heywood's plays, 34 *sq.*
- Reed, Arthur W., on the Canon of Heywood's plays, 27-57, 116-31; on 'Twelve Mery Gestes of the Wydow Edyth,' 186-99.
- Reed, John, New England Quaker, his books, 6.
- Regent, Henry VII's Ship, references to its burning, 117 *sq.*
- Rood, Theoderic, site of his printing-house at Oxford, 94; doubtful identity with the 'Johannes Ducheman,' who surrendered a tenement before Michaelmas, 1470, *ibid.*
- Roper, Margaret, her 'treatise on the Paternoster' suspect, 195;

- urges her servant's suit for the Widow Edith, *ibid.*
- Rosebury, Lord, on 'Vanity Fair' and 'Tom Jones,' 26.
- Rowse, Henry, victim of the Widow Edith, 189; his assessment, 196.
- Rudler, Gustave, on the morality of French literature, 203 *sqq.*
- Rushe, John, Pynson's dealings with, 150 *sqq.*
- Scholderer, Victor, review of Haebler's 'Bibliographia Ibérica del siglo xv,' Part 2, 268-75.
- Scott, Sir W., on 'Tom Jones,' 26.
- Sewall, Samuel, of Salem, Mass., books read by, 10 *sq.*
- Shakespeare, Wm., authenticity of signature in Bodleian copy of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Aldus, 1502) not impossible, 97-105; the deaths he gives his heroes, 66; papers by J. Dover Wilson, on the Copy for 'Hamlet' (1603), 153-85, and the 'Hamlet' Transcript (1593), 217-47.
- Shrines, mentioned in Heywood's plays, 45.
- Simpson, Richard, mistakes as to Munday's Visit to Rome 109 *sq.*
- Singer, Dorothea Waley, note on Sir John Mandeville, 275.
- Smith, William, nephew of Sir Thomas Smith, authorship of 'Discourse of the Commonwealth of England,' wrongly credited to, 86.
- Smyth, Walter, recommended as City Sword-bearer, 131, 193; his books, 194; his 'Twelve Mery Gestes of the Wydow Edyth' true stories, 186-99.
- Spain, fifteenth century printing in, 268-75.
- Stafford, William, the W. S. who set forth the book of the Commonwealth of England in his own name, 84-7.
- Stukeley, Captain, his stay at Rome, 107 *sqq.*
- Tarleton's Jests, ridiculed in 'Hamlet' (1603), 240 *sq.*
- Theseus de Cologne, notes on a lost edition, by F. W. Bourdillon, 73-83.
- Thomas, Henry, note on Spanish Incunabula quoted, 274.
- Thompson, Sir E. Maunde, reply to his attack on authenticity of Shakespeare signature in Bodleian Ovid, 99-105.
- 'Tom Jones,' errors and omissions in, 18-26.
- Toussaint-Collignon, Marcel, his poems, 139 *sq.*
- 'True Tragedy of Richard III,' Queen's play ridiculed in 'Hamlet,' 239 *sq.*
- Valencia, first printer at, 271.
- Vizland, Jacobus, German owner of printing press at Valencia (1475), 270.
- Wallace, Dr., his attribution of plays to W. Cornyshe, 122 *sqq.*
- Watermarks, in the earliest Oxford books, 93.
- Williams, Dr. Daniel, note on 'A Short Account' of his Library, 88.
- Williams, Sir Roger, Shakespeare's Fluellen, 244.
- Wilson, J. Dover on the Copy for 'Hamlet' (1603), 153-85; and the 'Hamlet' Transcript (1593), 217-47.
- Zacuthus, Almanach perpetuum of 1496 printed at Leiria, 273.

who
om-
own

at

am-

n a
our-

nish

eely
y of
od-

ions

his

III,'
am-

wner
ncia

a of
ggg.
ford

'A
rary,

are's

y for
and
(93),

m of
.